

17.428 // Friday 1-3, E51-385 // Spring 2011 // Version 1.0
MIT political science department
Stellar site: stellar.mit.edu/S/course/17/sp11/17.428/
Instructor: Stephen Van Evera

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY: THEORY AND METHOD

This course explores the causes and consequences of American foreign policy since 1898. Course readings cover both substantive and methods topics. Four substantive topics are covered: (1) major theories of American foreign policy; (2) major episodes in the history of American foreign policy and historical/interpretive controversies about them; (3) the evaluation of major past American foreign policies--were their results good or bad? and 4) current policy controversies, including means of evaluating proposed policies. Three methods topics are covered: (1) basic social scientific inference--what are theories? what are good theories? how should theories be framed and tested? (2) historical investigative methodology, including archival research, and, most importantly, (3) case study methodology. Historical episodes covered in the course are used as raw material for case studies, asking "if these episodes were the subject of case studies, how should those studies be performed, and what could be learned from them?"

Course requirements: students will be asked to write 2 short papers (6-10 page typed double spaced pages) and four 1-page exercises. One of the 6-10 page papers will be a case study; the other can be a case study or a policy evaluation. The 1-page exercises are due Feb. 18, Feb. 25, March 4, and March 11. The papers are due Friday April 22 and Monday May 16.

This is a graduate course. It is focused on considering how to write Ph.D. dissertations in the field of international relations and/or U.S. foreign policy. It is open to undergraduates by permission of the instructor only. Most undergraduates should instead take 17.40, American Foreign Policy (to be given in Fall 2011).

Recommended for purchase:

Daniel Benjamin and Steven Simon, The Age of Sacred Terror: Radical Islam's War Against America, 2nd ed. (NY: Random House, 2003)
G. John Ikenberry, ed., American Foreign Policy: Theoretical Essays, 6th ed. (Boston: Wadsworth Cengage, 2011).
John Lewis Gaddis, Strategies of Containment: A Critical Appraisal of Postwar American National Security Policy (rev. and expanded ed., 2005)
Justus D. Doenecke and John E. Wilz, From Isolation to War, 1931-1941, 3rd ed. (Wheeling, Ill.: Harlan Davidson, 2003).
Stephen Kinzer and Stephen Schlesinger, Bitter Fruit: The Story of the American Coup in Guatemala, exp. ed. (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1999)
George Herring, America's Longest War: The United States and Vietnam, 1950-1975, 4th ed. (Boston: McGraw-Hill, 2002)
Raymond Garthoff, Reflections on the Cuban Missile Crisis, rev. ed. (Washington, D.C.: Brookings, 1989)
Stephen Van Evera, Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997)
Thomas E. Ricks, Fiasco: The American Military Adventure in Iraq (New York: Penguin Press, 2006).
Marc Trachtenberg, The Craft of International History: A Guide to Method (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006)

All will be at the MIT COOP. You should also be able to get them through Amazon.com or BarnesandNoble.com.

Also at the COOP, and recommended:
Thomas G. Paterson, J. Garry Clifford, Shane J. Maddock, Deborah Kisatsky, and Kenneth J. Hagan, American Foreign Relations: A History Since 1895, 7th ed. (2010). Earlier editions will also do just fine.

Kate L. Turabian, A Manual for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations, 7th ed., rev. by Wayne C. Booth et al., (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007)

Some 50 pages of Paterson et al. are assigned. The rest is recommended for those in need of remedial history. So you might consider buying it as well. Turabian is a style reference book you should own and obey.

These books are also on reserve at Dewey library (building E-53, on Wadsworth Street). Most other assigned readings will be available online through Stellar, the MIT online syllabus service. A few assigned readings may be handed out in class.

Readings in the books for purchase listed above are denoted below with a "B"; readings on Stellar are denoted below with an "S"; readings that are handed out in class are denoted below with an "H".

I. THEORIES OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Feb. 4: Hypotheses, Laws, Theories and Case Studies

The course will be previewed. And a preview of Van Evera, Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science and Diamond and Robinson, Natural Experiments in History (assigned for next week) will be offered.

Feb. 11, 18, 25: Theories of American Foreign Policy

A. Framing and testing theories

- B 1. Van Evera, Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science, pp. 7-48 ("Hypotheses, Laws and Theories: A User's Guide"). This summarizes the way that I recommend students should frame and test theories.
- B 2. Ibid., pp. 89-96 ("What is a Political Science Dissertation?"). We define the range of acceptable topics too narrowly. All political science Ph.D. dissertations needn't invent or test a theory. There are other important--and sometimes easier--things to do.
- S 3. Jared Diamond and James A. Robinson, "Afterword," in Jared Diamond and James A. Robinson, eds., Natural Experiments of History (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010): 257-75. Controlled experiments offer strong tests of theories but are often infeasible for political scientists. Some argue that "natural experiments" and "quasi-experiments" can offer equally strong tests of theories. Maybe we should keep a sharp eye out for them.

Note: a glance at the section introductions in Ikenberry, AFP, will ease the following reading. (6th ed. pages are 53-4, 127-8, 219, 301-2, 401, 479, 551; 4th ed. pages are pp. 59-60, 137-138, 203-204, 297-298, 395-395, 465-466, 573-574; .)

B. Systemic explanations: "the environment governs conduct."

- S 1. Robert Jervis, "Offense, Defense, and the Security Dilemma," in Robert J. Art and Robert Jervis, International Politics, 3rd ed. (New York: 1992), pp. 146-169. Jervis argues that international conflict arises largely from the "security dilemma"--the

tendency of states to threaten others' security by their efforts to secure themselves. Can explanations for American conduct be inferred from this famous piece? If so, how much American conduct can Jervis' theory explain?

- B 2. Kenneth Waltz, "Anarchic Orders and Balances of Power," in Ikenberry, AFP, 6th ed., pp. 54-74 (pp. 60-83 in 5th ed.). Drawn from his classic Theory of International Politics. Can we infer an explanation for U.S. conduct?
- B 3. Melvyn P. Leffler, "The American Conception of National Security and the Beginning of the Cold War, 1945-1948," in Ikenberry, AFP, 5th ed., pp. 75-98 (pp. 84-111 in 5th ed.) A keystone article, arguing that national security concerns drove the U.S. into the Cold War.
- S 4. Stephen Walt, The Origins of Alliances, chapter 2 ("Explaining Alliance Formation"), pp. 17-49. More on how states respond to their environment, with some domestic hypotheses thrown in. Relevant to U.S. conduct?
- C. Economic explanations.
- S 1. Benjamin Cohen, The Question of Imperialism (NY: Basic Books, 1973), pp. 36-72, 121-131. Marxist explanations are no longer fashionable, but 50 years ago they were the dominant explanatory lens for US conduct among Third World scholars. Cohen offers an excellent critical explication of Marxist explanations of imperialism, including Marxist explanations for U.S. intervention in the Third World.
- D. National Values and Domestic Institutions as causes.
- B 1. Samuel Huntington, "American Ideals versus American Institutions," in Ikenberry, AFP, 6th ed., pp. 220-249 (pp. 214-247 in 5th ed., pp. 204-237 in 4th ed). **Read carefully only pp. 219-237**, skim the rest. U.S. democratic ideals as explanation.
- S 2. Walter Isaacson and Evan Thomas, The Wise Men: Six Friends and the World They Made (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1986), pp. 171-173, 731-733. Does the American foreign policy elite share America's wider democratic values? Or is it a subculture with unique values of its own? U.S. elite anti-democratic values as explanation.
- S 3. Seymour Hersh, The Price of Power (NY: Summit, 1983), pp. 108-111. Another culture snippet, on elite racial values.
- S 4. Theodore Lowi, "Making Democracy Safe for the World: On Fighting the Next War," in Ikenberry, AFP, 1st edition (sadly omitted from later editions), **read only pp. 268-273** (the pages on "policy overselling.") The policy sales process as explanation.
- S 5. Review again here Stephen Walt, The Origins of Alliances, chapter 2 ("Explaining Alliance Formation"), pp. 33-40 (assigned above). Common ideology as an explanation for alliance behavior. Is common ideology a glue or a solvent of alliance ties? Do we need research that measures the power of ideology as glue vs. nationalism as a solvent of alliances?

- E. Bureaucratic behavior and pathology as explanation.
- B 1. Graham Allison, "Conceptual Models of the Cuban Missile Crisis," in Ikenberry, AFP, 6th ed., pp. 402-441 (pp. 402-446 in 5th ed, pp. 396-441 in 4th ed). Distilled from the single most widely cited book in political science. Does it provide clear explanations?
- S 2. James C. Thompson, Jr., "How Could Vietnam Happen? An Autopsy," in Ikenberry, AFP, 4th ed (sadly omitted from later editions), pp. 454-463. A famous analysis that points to pathologies in how the government thinks. Experts are purged, analysts are silenced by fear of punishment for speaking politically incorrect truths, etc.
- C 3. Morton Halperin, with Priscilla Clapp and Arnold Kanter, Bureaucratic Politics and Foreign Policy (Washington, DC: Brookings, 1972), pp. 26-62. A good synopsis of organization theory relevant to foreign policy. Can it explain U.S. military policy? If so, how?
- F. Misperception as explanation.
- B 1. Robert Jervis, "Hypotheses on Misperception," in Ikenberry, AFP, 6th ed., pp. 480-499 (pp. 462-484 in 5th ed, pp. 466-488 in 4th ed). Psychology as the cause of national misperception.
- S 2. Robert Jervis, Perception and Misperception in International Politics (Princeton: Princeton U. Press, 1976), pp. 58-84. Jervis' famous piece outlines "deterrence" and the "spiral model." Can explanations for U.S. conduct be inferred from these models?
- S 3. Daniel Gilbert, "He Who Cast the First Stone Probably Didn't," New York Times, July 24, 2006. Why do spirals happen? Gilbert describes research noting that people underestimate their own aggressive conduct and exaggerate others' aggressive conduct. This makes for conflict spirals.
- S 4. Ken Silverstein, "Their Men in Washington: Undercover with D.C.'s Lobbyists for Hire," Harper's Magazine (July 2007): 53-61. A revealing window on how foreign lobbies operate in Washington. Silverstein demonstrates that even the most odious foreign interests can hire very capable former U.S. government officials with strong connections to the government and the press. A question about methods: what kind of study is this? Is it a "process tracing" case study? Is it an "experiment?" Is it strong or weak science?
- S 5. John Judis, "The Japanese Megaphone: Foreign Influences on Foreign Policymaking," in Eugene R. Wittkopf, ed., The Domestic Sources of American Foreign Policy: Insights and Evidence, 2nd ed. (New York: St. Martin's, 1994), pp. 95-105. A "propagandizing foreign lobby" explanation is implied here. Does this folk theory deserve attention?
- S 6. Lionel Barber, "The Selling of an African Conflict," Financial Times, March 16, 1990; and Reed Kramer, "Lobby Gets Results for Savimbi," Africa News, November, 1989, pp. 1-3. Accounts of the operations of another foreign lobby, that of UNITA and its murderous leader Jonas Savimbi. Can foreign governments really

wield influence through such machinations?

- S 7. John Mearsheimer and Stephen Walt, "The Israel Lobby," London Review of Books, Vol. 28, No. 6 (March 23, 2006). A famous article (later expanded into a book published in September 2007) arguing that an Israel lobby shapes U.S. policy toward Israel/Palestine and the wider Middle East, to the detriment of U.S. national security, and Israel's national security.
- S 8. Michael Massing, "The Storm Over the Israel Lobby," The New York Review of Books, Vol. 53, No. 10 (June 8, 2006). An Israel lobby has strong influence over U.S. foreign policy toward the Mideast. But Mearsheimer and Walt's article, which also claims that an Israel lobby strongly influences U.S. policy toward the Mideast, has major flaws.
- S 9. Nathan Guttman, "Pro-Israel Christians Mobilize in D.C.," The Jewish Daily Forward, July 21, 2007. A large and powerful group of evangelical Christians lobbies hard to prevent U.S. support for any land-for-peace settlement between Israel and its neighbors. These Christians are a powerful element of the Israel lobby.
- S 10. David Gergen, "There Is No 'Israel Lobby'," New York Daily News, March 26, 2006. Gergen argues that there is no Israel lobby. Who's right? How can we tell?
- S 11. Jeffrey Birnbaum, "The Influence Merchants," Fortune, December 7, 1998, pp. 134-152 **but read only pp. 134-135 and the chart on 137**. A "delphi method" survey reveals that Washington insiders rank the Israel lobby the second most powerful lobby in Washington--behind only the AARP and ahead of the NRA, the AMA, the AFL-CIO, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the VFW, and others. Can we believe the results of a delphi study like this?
- S 12. Nathan Guttman, "Olmert's Boast of 'Shaming' Rice Provokes Diplomatic Furor," Forward.com, published January 15, 2009, issue of January 23, 2009. Reported here: In early 2009 Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Olmert called U.S. President George W. Bush off a podium, asked him to instruct U.S. Secretary of State to refrain from voting for a U.N. Security Council resolution that Israel opposed, and Rice changed her vote accordingly. Do these events show that the Israeli government has influence in Washington?
- More writings on the Israel lobby are found online at www.americantaskforce.org/Israelloobby.htm.
- S 13. Robert G. Kaiser, "'Blue Team' Draws a Hard Line on Beijing: Action on Hill Reflects Informal Group's Clout," Washington Post, February 22, 2000, p. A1. Taiwan has powerful friends in Washington who work to persuade the U.S. to take a hard line toward China.
- S 14. David Pearson, "The Media and Government Deception," Propaganda Review, Spring 1989, pp. 6-11. A "domesticated press" explanation for U.S. misperception is implied here. Does this folk theory deserve attention?
- S 15. Eason Jordan, "The News We Kept To Ourselves," New York Times, April 11, 2003. The press can be cowed into practicing self-censorship. This allows tyrants to intimidate the press into

painting themselves in rose-colored hues.

- S 16. Nicholas Kristof, "Save Our Spooks," New York Times, May 30, 2003. Governments misperceive the world if their intelligence agencies misreport foreign realities. This can happen if government leaders press their intelligence agencies to tell the leaders what they want to hear regardless of the facts.
- S 17. Michael R. Beschloss, "Foreign Policy's Big Moment," New York Times, April 11, 1999, p. 4/17. Claimed here: during political campaigns U.S. politicians pander to U.S. voters by framing dangerous foreign policy positions that they cannot abandon once in office. The country is thereby led into folly. A corollary: a prime threat to America is ... an American public that responds well to irresponsible pandering.
- S 18. Irving Janis, "Escalation of the Vietnam War: How Could it Happen?" in Ikenberry, AFP, 4th ed (sadly omitted from later editions), pp. 544-572. "Groupthink" as the cause of national misperception. Janis points to pathologies much like those identified by Thompson ("How Could Vietnam Happen", above), but Janis' theory is wholly different (Janis points to psychological causes, Thompson to bureaucratic causes). Could these two theories of national misperception be tested against each other?
- S 19. Aaron Wildavsky, "The Self-Evaluating Organization," Public Administration Review, Vol. 32, No. 5 (September/October 1972): 509-520. Wildavsky argues that organizations (including government organizations) cannot evaluate their own performance. Sub-units that are created to evaluate will be coopted, deterred, or destroyed by the larger organization. Does this help explain the sluggish learning and frequent stupidity of governments?
- G. Public opinion dynamics as explanation.
- B 1. Michael Roskin, "From Pearl Harbor to Vietnam: Shifting Conceptual Paradigms and Foreign Policy," in Ikenberry, AFP, 6th ed., pp. 303-321 (pp. 312-333 in 5th ed., pp. 298-319 in 4th ed). A paradigm pendulum dynamic as explanation.
- S 2. Patricia Cohen, "Great Caesar's Ghost! Are Traditional History Courses Vanishing?", New York Times, **June 11, 2009**. The study of political, diplomatic and military history is being marginalized or destroyed in American universities. Some find this dangerous. Will an increasingly ignorant American public will choose unwisely on fateful security matters? As Santayana warned: "Those who forget the past are condemned to repeat it."
- H. Theories of the consequences of U.S. foreign policy: the domino theory, the credibility theory, theories and factual assumptions about nationalism.

II. AMERICAN GRAND STRATEGIES; OTHER POLICY DEBATES

March 4: Contending grand strategies past and present

Cold War era U.S. strategy (1947-1989):

- S 1. World map scaled to national gross domestic products, from The New York Times Magazine, November 7, 1976, p. 35, designed by Edwin O. Reischauer; and tables from Paul Kennedy, Rise and Fall of the Great Powers, and Kenneth Oye, ed., Eagle in a New World. Please focus on the map and tables 6, 17, 18, 31, 35, 4-1, and chart 2 on pages 3, 6, 7, 15, 16, 19, and 20 (handwritten numeration). Data on the relative GDPs of the states and regions of the world is summarized in these tables, and depicted in the world map. Many 20th century realists believed that this data defined the global distribution of power, and should define U.S. grand strategy. This data was the starting point for those who shaped the policies of the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration, and those who framed early U.S. Cold War strategy, including George F. Kennan and public commentators like Walter Lippmann. Were they right to find large meaning in this data? Should we continue to focus on this data today? (Does GDP still define national power?)
- B 2. John Lewis Gaddis, Strategies of Containment: A Critical Appraisal of Postwar American National Security Policy (rev. and expanded ed., 2005), chapter 2 ("George F. Kennan and the Strategy of Containment"), pp. 24-52. An explication of the ideas of the prime intellectual architect of America's Cold War containment policy.

Post-Cold War era strategy, pre-9/11 (1989-2001):

- S 1. Barry R. Posen and Andrew L. Ross, "Competing U.S. Grand Strategies," in Strategy and Force Planning Faculty, eds., Strategy and Force Planning (Newport, RI: Naval War College Press, 1995), pp. 115-134. A survey of four contending post-Cold War grand strategies. Which strategy is best? (Is this list complete?)
- S 2. Patrick E. Tyler, "U.S. Strategy Calls For Insuring No Rivals Develop," New York Times, March 8, 1992, and "Excerpts from Pentagon's Plan: 'Prevent the Re-Emergence of a New Rival,'" *ibid.* Some in the George H.W. Bush administration favored a strategy of U.S. supremacy or hegemony. Those who proposed this policy, e.g., Paul Wolfowitz, returned to power in the George W. Bush administration and continued to think along the same lines.
- S 3. Thomas L. Friedman, "U.S. Vision of Foreign Policy Reversed," New York Times, Sept. 22, 1993. The Clinton administration said it favored a strategy of "enlargement of the world's free community of market democracies."
- S 4. Robert J. Art, "A Defensible Defense: America's Grand Strategy After the Cold War," International Security, Vol. 15, No. 4 (Spring 1991): 5-53. A criticism of past U.S. assertiveness and a recommendation of future restraint.

Post-Cold War era strategy, post-9/11 (2001-present):

- S 1. Stephen Van Evera, "A Farewell to Geopolitics," in Melvyn P. Leffler and Jeffrey W. Legro, eds., To Lead the World: American Strategy after the Bush Doctrine (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, July 2008): 11-35. Other major powers no longer pose much threat to U.S. national security. But WMD terror and climate change are growing dangers. Thus the world again resembles 1815, when the greatest threat to the European powers was from below (specifically, from revolution), not from each

other. As in 1815 the right response is a concert strategy--a broad cooperation of all powers against WMD spread, WMD terror, and climate change.

- S 2. Barry R. Posen, "The Case for Restraint," in Ikenberry, AFP, 6th ed., 552-580. Posen argues that the U.S. creates more trouble than it solves by its global activism. A far more restrained U.S. grand strategy would be better. Critics responses, and Posen's response to the responses, are also found here. See also comments on Posen's article by distinguished scholars.
- S 3. Robert Kagan, "End of Dreams, Return of History," in Melvyn P. Leffler and Jeffrey W. Legro, eds., To Lead the World: American Strategy after the Bush Doctrine (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, July 2008): 36-59. Kagan is a leading neocoservative foreign policy thinker (somewhat on the moderate side of the neoconservative spectrum). He and his fellow neoconservatives had large influence on the George W. Bush administration's foreign policy, and will likely have large influence in the next Republican administration. They favor an aggressive foreign policy, aimed toward achieving a sizeable American sphere of influence in the Middle East.
- S 4. David E. Sanger, "Bush to Formalize A Defense Policy of Hitting First," New York Times, June 17, 2002. The Bush Administration embraced a general doctrine of preventive war against rogue states that aspire to develop weapons of mass destruction. Iraq was one of several rogue states that some in the Bush administration hoped to attack. Good idea?
- S 5. Keir A. Lieber and Robert J. Lieber, "The Bush National Security Strategy," U.S. Foreign Policy Agenda, An Electronic Journal of the U.S. Department of State, Vol. 7, No. 4 (December 2002). A friendly summary and assessment of the 2002 National Security Strategy of the United States of America (Washington D.C.: White House, September 2002) (NSS), the document that frames the main elements of the strategy selected by the Bush 43 Administration, including its general doctrine of preventive war (see Sanger, "Bush to Formalize," directly above).
- For more discussion of the 2002 U.S. strategy statement see the "Defense Strategy Review Page" of the Project on Defense Alternatives, at www.comw.org/qdr/.
- B 6. G. John Ikenberry, "America's Imperial Ambition," in Ikenberry, AFP, 5th ed., pp. 564-575 (omitted from the 6th ed). Reprinted from Foreign Affairs, Vol. 81, No. 5 (September/October 2002). An article from early in the George W. Bush Administration, arguing that the Bush team has embarked on a fateful imperial rampage. It will end badly. Others will eventually coalesce to check the U.S.
- S 7. "American Imperialism, Embraced," The New York Times Magazine, December 9, 2001 (2 pages); and Thomas E. Ricks, "Empire or Not? A Quiet Debate over U.S. Role," Washington Post, August 21, 2001 (3 pages). More color on rising arguments for a U.S. empire in the U.S. conservative movement. Do Tom Donnelly, William Kristol and Andrew Bacevich have a good idea?
- S 8. Michael Lind, Made in Texas: George W. Bush and the Southern Takeover of American Politics (NY: Basic Books, 2003): 128-153. What's causing the rise of imperialist thinking in Washington?

Lind argues that the Bush 43 coalition includes dangerous elements, including millennialist Christians who want to take U.S. Mideast policy in dangerous directions.

- S 9. Robert Lieber, "The Neoconservative Conspiracy Theory: Pure Myth," Chronicle of Higher Education, May 2, 2003. Lieber disputes claims that a neoconservative clique dominates Bush 43 foreign policy.
- S. 10. David E. Sanger and Peter Baker, "Obama Reorients Approach of National Security Strategy," New York Times, May 28, 2010. The Obama administration national security strategy drops the George W. Bush administration's unilateralist approach in favor of pursuing common action, and it downgrades the Bush emphasis on preventive war. It focuses on limiting WMD spread and halting climate change, as well as preventing terror.
- S 11. The entire Obama national security strategy is found at The White House, "National Security Strategy of the United States" (Washington, D.C., May 2010), available at http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/rss_viewer/national_security_strategy.pdf. You should skim it to get a sense for how the Obama administration presents its strategy.

March 11: The War on Terror; other national security policy issues.

- S 1. Daniel Benjamin and Steven Simon, The Age of Sacred Terror 2nd ed. (NY: Random House, 2003): 38-55, 61-68, 91-94, 419-489.
 Pages 38-55, 62-68, 91-94 describe the Islamist currents of thinking that spawned Osama Bin Laden's Al Qaeda. Al Qaeda's violence stems from a stream of Islamist thought going back to ibn Taymiyya, a bellicose Islamic thinker from the 13th century; to Abd al-Wahhab (1703-1792), the harsh and rigid shaper of modern Saudi Arabian Islam; to Rashid Rida (1866-1935) and Hassan al-Banna (?-1949); and above all to Sayyid Qutb (?-1966), the shaper of modern Islamism. Taymiyya, al-Wahhab and Qutb are covered here. Covered also (pp. 91-94) is the frightening rise of apocalyptic thinking in the Islamic world. What causes the murderous thinking described here?
 Pages 419-446 is a terrifying survey of the rise of nihilistic madness in a number of the world's great religions. Isn't the millennialist thinking described here likely at some point to lead believers in these views to use weapons of mass destruction on cities? What should the U.S. do about this threat??
 Pages 447-489 surveys and evaluates Bush 43 administration counter-terror strategies.
 Not assigned but also valuable are pp. 219-393, a survey of Clinton administration counter-terror strategies and policies. They are recommended.
- S 2. Sudarsan Raghavan, "A Somali Teen's Path to Jihad," Washington Post, November 27, 2010. An inside look at decisions to join and then leave the jihad.
- S 3. Craig Whitlock, "A-Qaeda's Yemen Affiliate Widens Its Search for Recruits and Targets," Washington Post, November 30, 2010. Al-Qaeda's branch in Yemen is ominously active. What to do about it?
- S 4. Graham Allison, "How to Stop Nuclear Terror," Foreign Affairs,

Vol. 83, No. 1 (January/February 2004): 64-74. A plan for action to prevent a disaster that we better prevent! (We will return to this subject in the last class period.)

- S 5. Graham Allison, "A Failure to Imagine the Worst," Foreign Policy, January 25, 2010. Many Americans underestimate the risk and consequences of a terrorist nuclear attack on the U.S. Will facts be enough to wake them from their torpor or will a bright flash be necessary?
- S 6. Graham Allison, "Nuclear Disorder," Foreign Affairs, Vol. 89, No. 1 (January/February, 2010): 74-85. The nuclear nonproliferation regime is eroding and may collapse, bringing a vast wave of proliferation. Urgent action is needed to prevent catastrophe.
- S 7. Stephen Flynn, "The Neglected Home Front," Foreign Affairs, Vol. 83, No. 5 (September/October 2004): 20-33. The U.S. is alarmingly vulnerable to terrorist attack. The door is wide open. We are sitting ducks.
- S 8. Husain Haqqani, "Extremism Still Thrives in Pakistan," International Herald Tribune, July 19, 2005. Pakistan is in the throes of something bad, but what is it? Religious extremism? Militarism? How should the U.S. respond?
- S 9. Stephen Van Evera, "Bush Administration, Weak on Terror," Middle East Policy, Vol. 13, No. 4 (Winter 2006): 28-38, online at http://web.mit.edu/ssp/people/vanevera/faculty_vanevera.html. A counter-terror strategy should comprise six main missions. The Bush administration neglected most of these six missions.
- S 10. National Defense Strategy of the United States of America (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, March 2005): 6-9. This summarizes Bush administration thinking on how to defeat Al Qaeda. Note the list on page 8 of eight major terrorist vulnerabilities to be targeted. Behind this strategy is the view that terrorist networks are like organisms whose care and feeding can be disrupted if their needs are understood.
- S 11. Martin Rees, Our Final Hour: A Scientist's Warning: How Terror, Error, and Environmental Disaster Threaten Humankind's Future in this Century--On Earth and Beyond (NY: Basic Books, 2003): 41-60, 73-88. The advance of science has a fearsome byproduct: we are discovering ever more powerful means of destruction. These destructive powers are being democratized: the mayhem that only major states can do today may lie within the capacity of millions of individuals in the future unless we somehow change course. Deterrence works against states but will fail against crazed non-state organizations or individuals. How can the spread of destructive powers be controlled?

We will return to this subject in the last class period.

For more on controlling the long term bioweapons danger see www.cissm.umd.edu/documents/pathogensmonograph.pdf

For more on Al Qaeda and the war on terror see www.lib.edu/govdoc/911.html, where Al Qaeda statements and other information are found.

March 18: Other policy issues and debates

A. Policy debates

On ethics and human rights:

- S 1. Leslie H. Gelb and Justine A. Rosenthal, "The Rise of Ethics in Foreign Policy," Foreign Affairs, Vol. 82, No. 3 (May/June 2003): 2-7. Ethical concerns once played little role in U.S. foreign policy; now they have an important place at the table.

On supporting national self-determination:

- S 1. Michael Lind, "In Defense of Liberal Nationalism," Foreign Affairs, Vol. 73, No. 3 (May/June 1994), pp. 87-99. Should the U.S. view national self-determination as a human right and lend it support? How much international chaos would follow if it did?

On saving failed states:

- S 1. Robert I. Rotberg, "Failed States in a World of Terror," Foreign Affairs, Vol. 81, No. 4 (July/August 2002): 127-141. Failed states are havens for terrorists. Can western powers resuscitate them? Should they try? Rotberg says yes, calling for a new Marshall Plan for Afghanistan and elsewhere.
- S 2. "Fixing a Broken World: The Planet's Most Wretched Places Are Not Always Its Most Dangerous," The Economist, January 29, 2009. A counter to the view that all failed states are dangerous.

On "preventive diplomacy" (action to forestall wars and human rights horrors):

- S 1. Chaim Kaufmann, "See No Evil," Foreign Affairs, Vol. 81, No. 4 (July/August 2002): 142-149. The U.S. could have stopped genocide in Rwanda in 1994 and elsewhere but chose not to. Good choice? Should the U.S. intervene to prevent such horrors?

Does this subject need more study?

On intervention to promote democracy:

- S 1. Larry Diamond, "What Went Wrong in Iraq," Foreign Affairs, Vol. 83, No. 5 (September/October 2004): 34-56. A case study in how not to intervene to promote democracy, by a learned student of democratization.
- S 2. Tom Zeller, "Building Democracy is Not a Science," New York Times, April 27, 2003. The United States' mixed record at exporting democracy by intervention is summarized here.
- S 3. Sylvia Nasar, "It's Never Fair to Just Blame the Weather," New York Times, January 17, 1993, p. E1. Third world democracy is good: it serves publics far better than authoritarian regimes. For example, democracies are far better at saving their citizens from starvation during famine. Dramatic evidence! (But compare with Noble, below.)
- S 4. Kenneth Noble, "Democracy Brings Turmoil in Congo," New York Times, January 31, 1994, p. A3. Third world democracy is bad: democratization causes communal conflict and civil war, e.g. as

in this instance. Dramatic evidence! (But compare with Nasar, above.)

- S 5. Benjamin Valentino, "Still Standing By: Why America and the International Community Fail to Prevent Genocide and Mass Killing," Perspectives on Politics 1:3 (September 2003): 565-578. Humanitarian intervention often fails to produce good results. The most effective way to intervene can be to help victims of mass killing escape their killers, not to oust killers from power. Ouster is nice but hard and messy.

On occupations, occupationology:

- S 1. David M. Edelstein, "Occupational Hazards: Why Military Occupations Succeed or Fail," International Security, Vol. 29, No. 1 (Summer 2004): 49-91. Some occupations turn out well-- Germany 1945-49, Japan 1945-51, Panama 1989, Grenada 1983. Others go very badly, as in Iraq since 2003 and Afghanistan since 2001. Why the difference?

On U.S. defense policy:

- S 1. Cindy Williams, "Budgets to Make America Safer," in Stephen Van Evera, How to Make America Safe: New Policies for National Security (Cambridge, MA: Tobin Project, 2006): 62-67, online at http://www.tobinproject.org/downloads/NS_Budgets_To_Make_America_Safer.pdf. The U.S. is spending a disproportionate share of its national security dollars on offense against threats, while spending too little on defense and prevention. It's time to innovate.

For detail on current budget issues (but not assigned) see Cindy Williams, "The U.S. Defense Budget," Testimony before the Committee on the Budget, United State Senate (February 23, 2010), online at the MIT SSP website.

An excellent history syllabus on late Cold War U.S. security policy by Prof. Frank Gavin of the University of Texas is at <http://uts.cc.utexas.edu/~gavinprp/>. See it for specific advice on historical research and security research topics.

On protecting the global commons--e.g., the global environment and global public health:

- S 1. Andrew C. Revkin, "Scientists Say a Quest for Clean Energy Must Begin Now," New York Times, November 1, 2002. A 2002 study warns that we must start looking for clean energy sources now or we may destroy the planet. Later may be too late. This will require broad international cooperation. Sadly we're not very good at international cooperation. In fact, we've done nothing since this article was published. Oh dear.
- S 2. Keith Bradsher, "Bird Flu is Back, Raising Fear of Spread Among Humans," New York Times, August 30, 2004. The 1918 flu killed 675,000 Americans--more than the two World Wars combined. Bummer. Could it happen again? Maybe! The particular flu virus discussed here, the highly lethal H5N1, has not become contagious between humans, but another lethal virus might. An answer may lie in worldwide preventive action. Again, everyone must cooperate. Hence this is a foreign policy problem.

On foreign aid, does it work, why we do it:

- S 1. Jagdish Bhagwati, "Banned Aid," Foreign Affairs, Vol. 89, No. 1 (January/February, 2010): 120-125. Dambisa Moyo's book (reviewed here) argues that foreign aid doesn't work. Donors feel good but little good results.

On women's rights and welfare:

- S 1. Isobel Coleman, "The Better Half," Foreign Affairs, Vol. 89, No. 1 (January/February, 2010): 126-130. Nicholas Kristof and Sheryl WuDunn's book, reviewed here, argues that when women are empowered, many evils abate and many good things ensue, including economic development, better governance, reduced population growth, and preservation of the environment. Should the empowerment of women be a prime goal of US foreign policy? If so, how can it be achieved?

B. Segue to Cases: the Case Study Method. How Should Case Studies Be Performed?

- S 1. Alexander L. George and Timothy J. McKeown, "Case Studies and Theories of Organizational Decision Making," in Advances in Information Processing in Organizations, Vol. 2 (Greenwich, Ct.: JAI Press, 1985), pp. 21-58. A classic statement on the execution of case studies.
- S 2. Arend Lijphart, "Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method," APSR, Vol. 65, 1971, pp. 682-693. Another important how-to-do-it on the case study method.
- B 3. Van Evera, Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science, pp. 49-88 ("What Are Case Studies? How Should They Be Performed?")
- S 4. Andrew Bennett, "Lost in Translation: Big (n) Misinterpretations of Case Study Research" (Paper presented to the annual meeting of the International Studies Association, Toronto, March 1997). An excellent survey of oft-repeated nasty myths about the case method.
- S 5. William J. Broad, "Crater Supports Idea on Extinction," New York Times, August 14, 1992. Here's a "case" that scientists are trying to explain. Are political/historical cases similar? Can political analysis proceed in the same way?
- S 6. "The C.I.A.'s El Salvador," New York Times, December 17, 1993, p. A39. Social science starts with "facts." But what "facts" can we believe? Moral of this story: you can't believe everything you read in the archives (or anywhere else).
- S 7. David Leven, "In Texas, the Death Penalty Still Fails to Deter," New York Times, Sept. 19, 1993, p. E16. Good social science starts with sound methods of scientific inference. Leven makes two blunders on this count: can you spot them?
- S 8. Ian Shapiro, "A Model That Pretends to Explain Everything," and Morris P. Fiorina, "When Stakes are High, Rationality Kicks In," both in New York Times, February 26, 2000, p. A15. Should students of U.S. foreign policy use rational choice methods more often? Two short pieces on the great debate over rational choice.

- S 9. Stephen M. Walt, "Rigor or Rigor Mortis? Rational Choice and Security Studies," International Security, Vol. 23, No. 4 (Spring 1999): 5-48. A famous and controversial audit of the contribution of work using rational choice methods to international studies. Are audits like this useful?
 Also of interest are:
 > Criticisms of this piece published in the Fall 1999 issue of International Security.
 > Jonathan Cohen, "When Did Political Science Forget About Politics?" The New Republic, October 25, 1999.
 > "The Revenge of the Nerds," New Republic, 1999, findable online. (A criticism of rational choice).
- S 10. Lawrence M. Mead, "Scholasticism in Political Science," Perspectives on Politics, Vol. 8, No. 2 (June 2010): 453-464. Mead argues that political science is losing its sense of priorities. Is he right?
11. Skim through syllabi for courses on qualitative methods taught in political science departments around the United States on the web at http://www1.maxwell.syr.edu/moynihan/cqrm/Syllabus_Database/. And see also the syllabus used by the **Institute on Qualitative and Multi-Method Research at Syracuse University**, online at http://www1.maxwell.syr.edu/moynihan/cqrm/Schedule_and_Reading_List_for_2010_Institute/.

In the past the "methods" field in political science was often assumed to consist solely of large-n (statistical) methods. While statistics courses were required at most schools, case study methods often were untaught. Case methods now get more attention, as these syllabi illustrate.

The IQRM student seminar is a valuable experience. The MIT political science department and MIT Center for International Studies usually fund several MIT political science graduate students to go, all expenses paid (but do remember to thank Dick Samuels and Rick Locke, they deserve it). Inquire about it. Maybe you can go.

Another valuable experience that will develop your methods skills is the **George Washington University Summer Institute for Conducting Archival Research (SICAR)**. Go there for a few days next summer and learn the secrets of plumbing the archives.

III. CASE HISTORIES: AMERICAN WARS, CRISES AND INTERVENTIONS

April 1, 8 (THERE IS NO CLASS on March 25--spring break): The Filipino-Spanish-American War; World War I; World War II; Historical methods

- S 1. Thomas G. Paterson, J. Garry Clifford, Shane J. Maddock, Deborah Kisatsky, and Kenneth J. Hagan, American Foreign Relations: A History Since 1895, 7th ed. (2010): 2-29. For those with the 6th or 5th edition, read pp. 11-27; for those with the 4th ed., read pp. 13-31. A textbook account of U.S. policy in the Spanish-American and U.S.-Filipino wars.
- S 2. David Healy, U.S. Expansionism: The Imperialist Urge in the 1890s (Madison: U. of Wisconsin Press, 1970):
 > Chapters 2, 3, and first part of chapter 6 (pp. 34-67, 110-113). Healy says that the U.S. had a large imperialist

movement in the 1890s, but that its eyes were not on the Philippines.

> Page 12: note evidence of a European intent to carve up China, emerging in late 1897 and early 1898.

- S 3. Louis Halle, Dream and Reality: Aspects of American Foreign Policy (NY: Harper Colophon, 1974), pp. 202-208, skim 202-205, read 205-208 more carefully. Halle notes that the U.S. failed to annex Spain's mid-Pacific islands--a huge blunder if the U.S. intended to use the Philippines as a base to project military power into China.
- S 4. Daniel B. Schirmer, Republic or Empire: American Resistance to the Philippine War (Cambridge: Schenkman, 1972), pp. 45-56, 66-67. More color on the thinking of U.S. elites. On p. 66, note mention of a December 24 cabinet meeting on the partition of China.
- S 5. Paterson et al., American Foreign Relations: A History Since 1895, 6th ed. (2005) pp. 67-91. For those with the 5th edition (2000) of Paterson et al., see pages 67-92; for those with the fourth edition see pp. 79-111. A standard textbook account of U.S. entry into, and conduct of, World War I.
- B 6. Doenecke and Wilz, From Isolation to War, 1931-1941, 3rd ed., pp. 1-38, 82-169. If you have the 1991 edition (2nd ed.) read pages 1-39, 76-158. The standard study of the onset of World War II.
- S 7. Bruce M. Russett, No Clear and Present Danger: A Skeptical View of the U.S. Entry Into World War II (New York: Harper & Row, 1972), pp. 11-43. A post-hoc argument against U.S. entry.
- S 8. Jonathan G. Utley, Going to War With Japan 1937-1941 (Knoxville: U. of Tennessee Press, 1985), pp. 151-156; and Waldo Heinrichs, The Threshold of War: Franklin D. Roosevelt and American Entry into World War II (NY: Oxford University Press, 1988), pp. 141-142, 177, 246-247 (note 68). Was the crucial American decision to cut off oil exports to Japan taken by a bureaucracy out of control? Utley and Heinrichs disagree. How can this mystery be unravelled? Study these pages carefully as they will come up again in the reading below in Marc Trachtenberg's book.
- S 9. Stephen Van Evera, "The War on Terror: Forgotten Lessons from World War II," Middle East Policy, Vol. 14, No. 2 (Summer 2007): 59-68, online at http://web.mit.edu/ssp/people/vanevera/faculty_vanevera.html. Does history offer "lessons" for current policy? How should they be inferred? Here's an attempt to infer lessons for the war on terror from American success in World War II. There is some overlap with Van Evera, "Bush Administration, Weak on Terror," assigned above, apologies for that.
- S 10. Marc Trachtenberg, The Craft of International History: A Guide to Method (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006), chapters 3-5 ("The Critical Analysis of Historical Texts"; "Developing an Interpretation through Textual Analysis"; and "Working With Documents"), pp. 51-169, and appendixes 1 and 2, pp. 199-256 (just look the appendices over quickly to get an idea what you can learn from them, don't try to memorize them). Also worth a gander but not assigned is chapter 2, "Diplomatic History and International Relations Theory." Read chapter 4

first, on the outbreak of the Pacific War. This chapter develops Trachtenberg's remarkable argument that FDR deliberately provoked war with Japan to bring the U.S. into war with Germany.

April 15: The Cold War, Korea, the 1950s; the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis

A. The Cold War and Korea.

- B 1. Gaddis, Strategies of Containment, pp. vii-23, 53-196. Review also pp. 24-52 (assigned several weeks ago.) The standard analytic account of American security policy under Truman and Eisenhower.
- S 2. John Lewis Gaddis, "The Emerging Post-Revisionist Synthesis on the Origins of the Cold War," Diplomatic History, Vol. 7, No. 3 (Summer 1983), pp. 171-190. An overview of the vast Cold War origins debate.
- S 3. John Lewis Gaddis, "The Tragedy of Cold War History," Diplomatic History, Vol. 17, No. 1 (Winter 1993), pp. 1-17. Cold War hawks were right. The U.S. could not have avoided the Cold War. Stalin was dangerously crazed.
- S 4. Melvyn P. Leffler, "Inside Enemy Archives," Foreign Affairs, Vol. 75, No. 4 (July/August 1996), pp. 120-135. Cold War hawks were wrong on some important points. Stalin hoped to cooperate with the United States after World War II. The Cold War was essentially inadvertent. The Soviets didn't cook up the Korean or Angolan wars.
- S 5. James I. Matray, "Civil is a Dumb Name for a War," Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations Newsletter, Vol. 26, No. 4 (December 1995), pp. 1-15. A historian frames the unresolved debates over the Korean war. What research would push these debates toward resolution? How should a case study that addressed them be framed?
- S 6. Jerald A. Combs, American Diplomatic History: Two Centuries of Changing Interpretations (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983), pp. 197-198, 258-281. The present changes our understanding of the past. Should history work this way?
Students interested in the writing of history and in the creation of political ideas should explore further in this excellent book, now sadly out of print. (More of it is assigned below.)

B. Cuban Missile Crisis 1962

- S 1. Raymond Garthoff, Reflections on the Cuban Missile Crisis, rev. ed. (Washington, D.C.: Brookings, 1989), pp. 1-139. The best survey of the state of the art on the history of the Cuban Missile Crisis, which evolved considerably during 1962-1989.
- S 2. Raymond L. Garthoff, "Some Observations on Using the Soviet Archives," Diplomatic History, Vol. 21, No. 2 (Spring 1997), pp. 243-257. **Focus on pp. 249-257, skim the rest.** An update on what we learned in the 1980s-early 1990s about the Cuban Missile Crisis. Answer: a lot.
- S 3. Robert A. Divine, "Alive and Well: The Continuing Cuban Missile

Crisis Controversy," Diplomatic History, Vol. 18, No. 4 (Fall 1994), pp. 551-560.

For more on the Cuban Missile Crisis, visit an excellent website on the crisis put together by the **National Security Archive** at www.nsarchive.org/nsa/cuba_mis_cri. Documents can be seen, tapes can be listened to, and intelligence photos can be viewed at this site. And for more sources on the crisis see a website from Harvard's Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, www.cubanmissilecrisis.org.

ST 4. Jean Edward Smith, "The Peace Presidents," New York Times, May 9, 2007. Is history written to emphasize the uses of force by Presidents, and to downplay their horsetrading and compromise? The 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis was settled by concessions from both sides, although Kennedy hid the U.S. concessions from public view and painted the outcome as a pure Soviet backdown. Smith notes that other war-hero presidents, including Grant and Eisenhower, eschewed force and cut deals at important moments, and more often than popular history remembers. Grant was quite a peacenick! George Washington also stood against strong hawkish criticism to reach Jay's treaty, which avoided war with Britain; and John Adams resisted strong demands for war with France, losing office as a result. But their policies look good in retrospect.

C. An Adventure in the Archives. Also assigned for this week: a document treasure hunt in the Harvard Government Documents library declassified documents collection; and/or in the John F. Kennedy Presidential Library, which holds most of the Kennedy Administration's archives.

More on this later.

A relevant snippet is:

S 1. Tim Weiner, "Keeping the Secrets that Everyone Knows," New York Times, October 30, 1994, p. 16E. The JFK library is hiding the record from us.

As preparation for the Adventure please also consult the appendices to Marc Trachtenberg's book Craft of International History. Also very useful are the online versions of these appendices, replete with links to the sources he mentions in that book, at www.polisci.ucla.edu/faculty/trachtenberg/methbk/Appendix1.html; and [www.polisci.ucla.edu/faculty/trachtenberg/methbk/Appendix1\(links\).html](http://www.polisci.ucla.edu/faculty/trachtenberg/methbk/Appendix1(links).html).

April 22: The Indochina War, 1945-1975; The Iraq war of 1991

B 1. Herring, America's Longest War, chapters 4 and 7 (pp. 131-169, 271-320 in the 4th edition). The standard account, from a middle-of-the-road perspective, of the key decisions to escalate and de-escalate the war.

S 2. Sol W. Sanders & William Henderson, "The Consequences of 'Vietnam'", Orbis, vol. 21, no. 1 (Spring 1977), pp. 61-76. The authors re-evaluate the propositions at issue in the debate over the war, concluding that postwar events show that the hawks were right, and the doves wrong.

S 3. Clark Clifford with Richard Holbrooke, Counsel to the President

(NY: Random House, 1991), pp. 612-614. A short counterpoint to Sanders and Henderson.

- S 4. Review again Janis, "Groupthink," and Thompson, "How Could Vietnam, Happen?" assigned above.
- S 5. Jerald A. Combs, American Diplomatic History: Two Centuries of Changing Interpretations (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983), pp. 299-300, 367-383. More on the impact of the present on the past. Indochina transformed the academic study of American diplomatic history; pre-Vietnam episodes were now reinterpreted more critically. (Should history work this way?)
- S 6. Morris J. Blachman, "The Stupidity of Intelligence," in Morton H. Halperin and Arnold Kantor, eds., Readings in American Foreign Policy: A Bureaucratic Perspective (Boston: Little, Brown, 1973), pp. 328-334. The "intelligence to please" problem has long been with us. We saw "intelligence to please" in U.S. estimates of Iraqi WMD in 2003. And we saw it earlier in Vietnam, says Blachman. How can it be cured? Should it be studied?
- S 7. Kenneth Pollack, The Threatening Storm: The Case for Invading Iraq (NY: Random House, 2002): 11-54. How did the U.S. confrontation with Saddam Hussein develop? Pollack offers good background.
- May 29: Other U.S. Third World interventions; the second Iraq War, 2003-
- S 1. Federico Gil, Latin American-United States Relations (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1971), chapter 4 ("The Interventionist Era, 1904-1933"), pp. 86-116. A standard factual synopsis of the main events in the Caribbean.
- S 2. Richard J. Barnet, Intervention and Revolution: America's Confrontation with Insurgent Movements Around the World (New York: Meridian, 1972), chapter 10 ("The Subversion of Undesirable Governments"), pp. 264-297. A short history of some of the better-known CIA covert operations. Are such operations effective? Under what circumstances? Against what kinds of regimes?
- S 3. Kinzer and Schlesinger, Bitter Fruit: The Untold Story of the American Coup in Guatemala, pp. xi-xv, 65-117. More details on events leading up to the 1954 coup in Guatemala. Please **skim pp. 65-77, read most carefully pp. 79-97**, a rare inside look at a major foreign-policy-directed propaganda operation.
- S 4. James A. Bill, The Eagle and the Lion: The Tragedy of American-Iranian Relations (New Haven: Yale U. Press, 1988), chapter 2 ("Petroleum Politics and the American Intervention of 1953"), pp. 51-97; but **read carefully only pp. 78-86, 92-94** (skim the rest). A more detailed account of the coup summarized by Barnet (#2 above.)
- S 5. Peter J. Schraeder, "Paramilitary Intervention," in Peter J. Schraeder, ed., Intervention Into the 1990s, 2nd ed. (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1992), chapter 8, pp. 131-151; focus on pp. 137-149 ("The Reagan Doctrine and Paramilitary Intervention"), skim the rest. (The version posted on STELLAR may be from the 1990 edition, in which case these pages are wrong. But the

older edition works fine: find the "Reagan Doctrine and Paramilitary Intervention" section and read it.) What policies flowed from the Reagan Doctrine? The four wars waged under its rubric are described here.

- S 6. Thomas E. Ricks, Fiasco: The American Military Adventure in Iraq (New York: Penguin Press, 2006): 12-84. An informed look at the Bush 43 administration's thinking and decisions during the runup to the 2003 Iraq war.
- S 7. Kevin R. Woods with Michael R. Pease, Mark E. Stout, Williamson Murray, and James G. Lacey, Iraqi Perspectives Project: A View of Operation Iraqi Freedom from Saddam's Senior Leadership (Washington, DC: Institute for Defense Analysis, 2006): 1-32. What was Saddam thinking? Answers are found here. Compare what the U.S. thought Saddam was thinking with the record found here.
- S 8. James Bamford, A Pretext for War: 9/11, Iraq, and the Abuse of America's Intelligence Agencies (NY: Anchor, 2005): 253-270 (skim 253-260, read 260-269). A conspiratorial explanation for the U.S. war in Iraq in 2003, focused on the neoconservatives. Also worthwhile on the neoconservatives but not assigned are pp. 277-282. And see chapter 13 (pp. 333-366) on "intelligence to please."

IV. CONCLUSION

May 6: Current crises; the future of American foreign policy

- S 1. Samuel P. Huntington, "The Coming Clash of Civilizations: Or, the West Against the Rest," New York Times, June 6, 1993, p. E19. Humankind will again be at its own throat, this time in a confrontation of great civilizations.
- S 2. Richard Bernstein and Ross H. Munro, "The Coming Conflict with America," Foreign Affairs, Vol. 76, No. 2 (March/April 1997), pp. 18-32. America's China doves (e.g., Robert Ross) are wrong wrong wrong. The U.S. and China are on a collision course, and the U.S. should stay on it. (This article is from 1997 but the view it frames has influential adherents in the U.S. today.)
- S 3. Aaron L. Friedberg and Robert Ross, "Here Be Dragons: Is China a Military Threat?" The National Interest, No. 103 (September/October 2009): 19-34. Is China 10 feet tall or 2 feet tall? What research could narrow the disagreement between the two authors?
- S 4. "Robert H. Frank, "A Small Price for a Large Benefit," New York Times, February 21, 2010. Climate change is real and dangerous. We face a 10 percent chance of a catastrophic 12-degree climb in temperatures by 2100. And: we can prevent catastrophic climate change at modest cost. Maybe we should do it!
- S 5. Ruth Greenspan Bell, "What to Do About Climate Change," Foreign Affairs, Vol. 85, No. 3 (May/June 2006): 105-114. Bell outlines a program for action to address the grave and growing danger of climate change.
- S 6. Nicholas D. Kristof, "The Nuclear Shadow," New York Times, August 14, 2004. We are losing control of nuclear weapons. No one in Washington seems to care. A collective snore is heard

from the government. This is a recipe for immense calamity. Isn't it obvious that unless we take prompt action terrorists will get hold of nuclear materials, make nuclear weapons, and nuke us until we glow?

- S 7. Review again Allison, "How to Stop Nuclear Terror," and Rees, Our Final Hour, assigned above. What policy toward the spread of weapons of mass destruction should the U.S. pursue?
- S 8. Review again Keir A. Lieber and Robert J. Lieber, "The Bush National Security Strategy," U.S. Foreign Policy Agenda, An Electronic Journal of the U.S. Department of State, Vol. 7, No. 4 (December 2002), assigned above. When does preventive war make sense?
- S 9. David D. Newsom, "Foreign Policy and Academia," Foreign Policy, No. 101 (Winter 1995-96), pp. 52-67. **Read only pp. 62-66** ("Communication Problems"), lightly skim the rest. Academics are obfuscatory, amphibolous, obscurantist, and recondite. Also, they are hard to understand. Should they address their work to real people once in a while?
- S 10. Joseph S. Nye Jr., "Scholars on the Sidelines," Washington Post, April 13, 2009: A15. Political scientists increasingly focus on questions of little concern to the wider world. Is this ok? If Nye is right, why should the wider society pay our upkeep? Are we not parasites? What can be done about the situation Nye describes?
- B 11. Van Evera, Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science, pp. 117-121 ("Professional Ethics"). Does political science need professional ethics? If so, what should they be?
- S 12. Oliver Staley, "Goldman Harvard Recruit Pledges to Do No Harm, Fights For Oath," Bloomberg.com, May 20, 2010. A code of ethics is proposed for Harvard Business School graduates. Should political scientists have such an oath? Would they better serve the world if they did?
- S 13. Larry Diamond, "What Political Science Owes the World," PS: Political Science & Politics Online Forum (2002): 1-11, retrieved from www.apsanet.org/imgtest/PSOnlineDiamond911.pdf.
- S 14. Stephen Van Evera, "Trends in Political Science and the Future of Security Studies," Security Studies Program Annual Report 2009-2010 (Cambridge, MA: MIT Security Studies Program, November 2010). Two issues are considered: (1) What skills does the political science field need in order to be a strong science? Is causal inference the only skill, or are other skills also important? (2) How to choose between quantitative and qualitative methods?
- B 15. Review again Van Evera, "What is a Political Science Ph.D. Dissertation?", Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science, pp. 67-72 (discussed in first class). What should be the field agenda?

Theories of American Foreign Policy. Exercise 1 (1-page) due. Part 2: American Grand Strategies. 3. Contending Grand Strategies Past and Present. 4. The War on Terror. Other National Security Policy Issues. 5. Other Policy Issues and Debates. Exercise 2 (1-page) due. Part 3: Case Histories: American Wars, Crises and Interventions. 6. The Filipino-Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II. 7. Historical Methods. 8. The Outbreak of the Pacific War, 1941. 9. The Cold War, Korea, and the 1950s. 10. The Indochina War, 1945-1975. Foreign policy analysis (FPA) is a branch of political science dealing with theory development and empirical study regarding the processes and outcomes of foreign policy. Foreign policy analysis is the study of the management of external relations and activities of state. Foreign policy involves goals, strategies, measures, methods, guidelines, directives, agreements, and so on. National governments may conduct international relations not only with other nation-states but also with international